

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *HYLA LACTEA*
DAUDIN, 1803 Z.N.(S.)2341
(see vol. 41, pp. 122-124)

By Andrew F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

The object of this petition by Lynch & Duellman to suppress *Hyla lactea* Laurenti appears to be threefold: to conserve *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis* (Daudin, 1803), to validate *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838 and to conserve *Sphaenorhynchus lacteus* (Daudin, 1803). The first has my full support, the second I consider unnecessary and the third I strongly oppose.

Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis is widely used and the only name currently in use for the species. To replace it with *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, a name virtually unused in the last 200 years and whose identity is open to doubt, would certainly not be in the best interests of stability. I therefore agree that *H. lactea* Laurenti should be suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority.

Lynch & Duellman state that the currently used generic name *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi is invalid because its type species is a junior primary homonym. I can find nothing in the Rules to suggest that homonymy of its type species in any way affects the validity or availability of a nominal genus. Thus no action by the Commission is needed to conserve *Sphaenorhynchus*. Its type species should be cited as *Hyla lactea* Daudin, an invalid senior subjective synonym of *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero.

The third objective of Lynch & Duellman's petition is to conserve the specific name *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803, a junior primary homonym of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768. With this I cannot agree. A search of the literature reveals that there has been little stability of nomenclature as far as this species is concerned. *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin, 1803, was in general use until 1961 when Rivero (*Bull. Mus. comp. Zool., Harv.* vol. 126, p. 137) indicated that it was a junior primary homonym of *Hyla aurantiaca* Laurenti, 1768. During the next few years *Hyla lactea* Daudin enjoyed a brief resurrection until Rivero (*Copeia*, 1969, p. 701) pointed out that this name too was preoccupied and proposed *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* (nom. nov. pro *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin). In all, I found 25 references to this species published in the last 50 years. Of these, 12 use *aurantiaca* (the latest in 1970) and 3 use *lactea* (between 1961 and 1966). Since 1969 there have been 10 uses of *eurhostus*. To the best of my knowledge this last is the only name currently in use and includes among its users both Lynch and Duellman. My search of the literature may not have been exhaustive but I find it difficult to believe that I have overlooked sufficient references to change the picture significantly. To use the plenary powers to overthrow a currently accepted name in favour of a little used one is surely unthinkable. I therefore totally oppose the proposal to suppress *Hyla lactea* Laurenti for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy.

Finally, I see that Lynch & Duellman do not cite 10 publications by at least 5 different authors during the last 50 years in which the name *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis* is used as a senior synonym (Art. 79b). These authors should be asked to supply this information. When this has been done, I suggest the Commission be asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *lactea* Laurenti, 1768, as published in the combination *Hyla lactea*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

- (2) as in Lynch & Duellman.
- (3) to place the specific name *eurhostus* Rivero, 1969, as published in the combination *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) to place the generic name *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838 (gender: masculine, type species by monotypy, *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803, a junior primary homonym of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, and an invalid senior subjective synonym of *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero, 1969) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES FOR
NYMPHULA SCHRANK, 1802. Z.N.(S.)2384
 (see vol. 39, pp. 209–212)

By W. Speidel (*Gerwigstrasse 18, D-7500 Karlsruhe 1, West Germany*)

I support the application of Fletcher & Nye, 1982, concerning the species best known as *Nymphula stagnata* (Donovan, 1806).

In 1793 Hübner first published a figure of this species under the name *Phalaena potamogalis*. Unfortunately, this was a misidentification of *Phalaena potamogalis* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775, which is an unjustified emendation of *Phalaena (Geometra) potamogata* Linnaeus, 1758, a completely different species now considered to be synonymous with *Phalaena (Geometra) nymphaeata* Linnaeus, 1758.

When Schrank described his genus *Nymphula*, he included a species *potamogalis* in the sense of Hübner, 1793 and 1796 and it was this species that Moore, 1887, cited as the type species of the genus. The valid specific name for this species is *stagnata* Donovan, 1806, and Fletcher & Nye were quite right to ask the Commission to designate that species as the type species of *Nymphula*. This corresponds with Schrank's and Moore's concept of the genus.

Account must, however, be taken of *Phalaena nitidulata* [Hufnagel], 1767 (pp. 618–619) from the vicinity of Berlin, which was placed in the synonymy of *Nymphula nymphaealis* Treitschke, 1829, non [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775 by Treitschke. This is the same species as *Phalaena stagnata* Donovan. The description by [Hufnagel] strongly supports Treitschke's interpretation: '*Phalaena nitidulata*, Der Wasservogel. Schneeweiss mit einigen irregulären hellbraunen Zeichnungen. Aufenthalt der Phaläne bei Gewässern im Grase. Zeit der Phaläne Julius und August. Grösse der Phaläne von der dritten. Selten.' [Hufnagel] also described *Phalaena nymphaeata* as being 'of the third size', which was his way of giving the relative size of each species. We cannot be completely sure of the identity of [Hufnagel's] species except by reference to Treitschke's interpretation.

In order to avoid any confusion, and to conserve a well-known name, I ask the Commission to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *nitidulata* [Hufnagel], 1767, as published in the binomen *Phalaena nitidulata*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.